



[Supreme Court of California](#)

350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797

NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Cathal Conneely](#), 415-865-7740

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

October 23, 2015

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of October 19, 2015

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#15-184 *People v. Alexander*, S229041. (C073170; nonpublished opinion; San Joaquin County Superior Court; SF082949A.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to recall sentence.

#15-185 *People v. Dixie*, S229273. (E060217; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; RIF121599.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to recall sentence.

The court ordered briefing in *Alexander* and *Dixie* deferred pending decision in *People v. Chaney*, S223676 (#15-13), and *People v. Valencia*, S223825 (#15-14), which present the following issue: Does the definition of “unreasonable risk of danger to public safety” (Pen. Code, § 1170.18, subd. (c)) under Proposition 47 (“the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act”) apply on retroactivity or other grounds to resentencing under the Three Strikes Reform Act of 2012 (Pen. Code, § 1170.126)?

#15-186 *People v. Anderson*, S228552. (B251527; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA368517.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed judgments of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Canizales*, S221958 (#14-134), which presents the following issue: Was the jury properly instructed on the “kill zone” theory of attempted murder?

#15-187 *People v. Guzman*, S229205. (A140435; nonpublished opinion; Solano County Superior Court; FCR289829.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re A.S.*, S220280 (#14-111), which presents the following issue:

Must no-contact probation conditions be modified to explicitly include a knowledge requirement?

#15-188 *People v. Mesinas*, S227887. (C074781; nonpublished opinion; Sacramento County Superior Court; 12F04768.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses.

#15-189 *People v. Soria*, S228653. (C070238; 239 Cal.App.4th 123; Sacramento County Superior Court; 10F05942.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses.

The court ordered briefing in *Mesinas* and *Sorias* deferred pending decision in *People v. White*, S228049 (#15-173), which presents the following issue: Was defendant properly convicted of both rape of an intoxicated person and rape of an unconscious person for a single act of sexual intercourse?

#15-190 *People v. Villareal*, S228648. (H038081; nonpublished opinion; Monterey County Superior Court; SS090625.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed judgments of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Sanchez*, S216681 (#14-47), which presents the following issue: Was defendant's Sixth Amendment right to confrontation violated by the gang expert's reliance on testimonial hearsay (*Crawford v. Washington* (2004) 541 U.S. 36)?

#

The Supreme Court of California is the state's highest court and its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The court's primary role is to decide matters of statewide importance and to maintain uniformity in the law throughout California by reviewing matters from the six districts of the California Courts of Appeal and the fifty-eight county superior courts (the trial courts). Among its other duties, the court also decides all capital appeals and related matters and reviews both attorney and judicial disciplinary matters.